

Nov. H. C. Wright

THE LIBERATOR  
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY  
AT NO. 25, CORNHILL, BY  
SAMUEL KNAPP.  
Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Editor.



# THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VIII. OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD, OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. NO. 8.  
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS. FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1838.

AGENTS.  
Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Editor.  
Agents for the Liberator in various parts of the country.  
Agents for the Liberator in various parts of the country.

some of the most dangerous, and incendiary sentiments. They are even now received at our post office, and distributed among our citizens, under the cloak of religion. The Journal is a Presbyterian paper, it seems, the organ of Dr. Beecher, one of the most incendiary fanatics that ever endeavored to disturb the peace of society. It is time that our Legislature should act, and take decisive steps to have an abolition Journal that comes from Cincinnati or elsewhere, burned by the common hang-man, and the severest penalties inflicted on any one found in our State disseminating their poisonous contents. Let the South come to the unanimous conclusion to consume no articles of trade or manufactures from Cincinnati, while she tolerates an establishment which is striking at the very source of our happiness as a people.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

### LETTERS TO JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

#### LETTER II.

HONORED FELLOW-CITIZEN:

Why are not our petitions read, referred, examined and reported upon in due form? The answer is obvious; no man in Congress will have the hardihood deliberately to proclaim before this country and the world, that the existence of slavery in the District of Columbia is compatible with the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution of the United States, and the fundamental principles of our Federal compact. They know that they would either become the laughing stock of the world by their Jesuitical evasions or chicanery, or the detestation of mankind by openly justifying the most enormous atrocities and crimes—and so they hope to escape from the sentence of condemnation, by craftily transferring their petitions among the dark and impenetrable recesses of their 'Slave-Quarters.'

We therefore tell them, that their wicked device shall not benefit or serve them. Our demand shall be heard. To our requisition they shall respond. Our cry cannot be silenced. And our prayer must and shall be granted, in spite of all that Post-Office Robbers can contrive, and Lying Bible Dealers can execute, and destroyers of the printing press can threaten, and murderers of Ministers of the Gospel can accomplish. In the hands of the Samson of Truth, all their godly machinations are powerless as the new cords which became as flax that was burnt with fire, when the Spirit of the Lord comes mightily for the deliverance of his servants, and the discomfiture of the unchristianized Philistines.

As it is perfectly non-essential respecting the subject of the petition, so it is equally unimportant who and what may be the number of the petitioners. Much of the energy and vociferation of chivalry has been expended upon the multitude and character of the petitioners. At one time, it has been pronounced to be merely the temporary effervescence of a few misguided 'fanatics'; but it is irrefragable, that they who assert that objection, cannot believe their own declaration, when they see the hundreds of thousands of names, which, like the handwriting on the wall of the saloon that produced the change in the impious Belshazzar's countenance, and troubled his thoughts, and loosened the joints of his loins, and made his knees smite one against another, frighten those men who lift themselves up against the God of heaven. It is not the small array and the short roll of signatures which excite the slaveholders' wrath and cruel visages, it is the myriads of attestations which they behold to the thunders of conscience, and the mandates of God. They there see the TEXT, which is written upon themselves!

As you may not have time to analyze the mile of names which lie under your table, I would remind you that there are some hundreds of ministers of the Gospel, of ten or twelve denominations, all of whom are bound by the most solemn obligations, to promulgate and maintain the doctrines of Christian truth and philanthropy, as far as they can discover it. To whom may be added, thousands of church officers, who are animated by the same spirit, actuated by the same motives, and under similar responsibilities. After them are arrayed scores of thousands of Christians, landed together in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace, all walking in 'the pathway of righteousness,' and 'holding forth the word of life.' You are also fully authorized to declare, that among all the scattered multitudinous hosts of petitioners, not one lychee, or one mobster, or one house-breaker, or one incendiary, or one murderer, can possibly be found; and more, not one of all that vast throng can be named, who does not categorically condemn all those lawless acts and felonies.

But you are daily seated among nominal legislators, who obstinately defend all those nefarious proceedings, as Christians, necessary and justifiable, if they are perpetrated to destroy the property, disgrace the reputation, torture the person, or extinguish the life of a citizen, who believes that a colored human being cannot be property; or, to use the slave-driver's 'odious and infamous' phraseology, 'chattels to all intents and purposes whatever'; and that to detain such persons in 'the house of bondage,' as the Presbyterian Confession of Faith affirms, renders the slaveholder a 'sinner of the first rank, and guilty of the highest kind of theft.'

The attempt to persuade unthinking citizens that slavery is merely a political topic, is the cardinal deception, with which the slaveholders are striving to blind the eyes of the people. It is not a political question, any more than that it is an indescribable moral pestilence, which pervades all the ramifications of our confederacy, and which can only be extirpated by the same means through which all other sins are to be diminished and eradicated, by developing the iniquity of the transgression so evidently, that by the enlightenment of the public mind, and the enactment of suitable laws to abolish it, the direful evil may be removed.

That slavery is not a political question, is self-evident from one fact; that your petitioners include men of all shades of merely political differences of opinion, which they regard as of secondary importance, when compared with the infinitely splendid inquiry—'Shall three millions of native American citizens be free?' In any case, the members who hold seats around you will find, that if their other discordances were noisy and incompressible as the confusion of tongues at Babel, yet upon this topic they all are 'of one language and of one speech,' and their voice is this—that their petitions for the abolition of slavery, in the District of Columbia, shall be received by Congress, and more, THAT THEY SHALL BE GRANTED! It would be far preferable for them at once to assent with a good grace, to that which otherwise they will be obliged to transfer to their successors, who will derive double honor for consummating that glorious triumph of liberty, which the present race of slave-dealing chivalry, and their dog-faced competitors for public ignominy and the world's scorn, are apparently resolved not to complete.

Besides, among all the topics which can possibly be selected, to which American women can consistently devote their attention, and upon which they are bound to combine their energies, that of slavery is the most suitable. In the annals of the human family, it is believed, there is not the counterpart to the condition of the colored women in the United States. Several hundred thousand nearly of our female inhabitants are arrived at mature age, and as many more are hastening on to puberty, all of whom are doomed to the vilest debasement, ever the victims of ungodly lust, and realizing the invariable dissolution of all the social relations, and the loss of all domestic privileges. In enormity, and extent, and continuance, that inordinate wickedness, the entire abrogation of the matrimonial covenant, and the consequent degradation of woman, are unparalleled in the history of mankind; for there is no tribe, however barbarous, who have lost all trace of that connubial obligation and bond, which the all-wise and all-merciful Creator himself instituted in the garden of Eden, when our race commenced its existence. But in this republic, the boasted land of freedom, law, intelligence, and christian morals and enjoyments—one fifth part of all our women are despoiled of all protection. They are exposed to every outrageous indignity. To the brutal demand of any lawless white man, they are obliged to submit. By heart-rending tortures, they are coerced to degradation, which, to woman, is most repulsive. It is their doom to be obliged to sacrifice their tenderest affections and conscientious purity. They are scourged, so that they are obliged to conceal their instinctive sensibilities. Of a husband's love, a father's guardianship, a son's aid, and a brother's endearments, they are ever robbed. In short, they are merely human tools, to ponder to the sensuality, and to gratify the impetuous lusts of inhuman task-masters. Hence the slave States are one vast arena of pollution, in which multifarious fornication, incest, polygamy, adultery, with other uncleanness, and their inseparable crimes, are constantly perpetrated.

I shall not pause to inquire whether Mr. Calhoun, or Mr. Preston, or Mr. King, or Mr. Hayne, or Mr. Patton, or Mr. Legare, or Mr. Wise, or Mr. Doughface, admires the above picture; it is the graphical delineation of slavery, as it now exists in the southern States, through all their bounds; with variations as to the enormity of the offences, but a perfect identity in the aggravated guilt.

Now, to pretend that our northern christian matrons and maidens have nothing to do with all that indescribable turpitude is so absurd, that it requires no refutation; and to allege that they ought not to have any opinion, or to express any objection respecting it, because it is a political topic, and women should have no connection with politics, may suit the latitude of a slave-driver's domain, and the infected atmosphere which hovers over it; but it will not thrive among women who value the inestimable blessings of the nuptial relation, and who realize the purity and peaceableness of Jehovah's gracious appointment. Therefore, it is not only the rich privilege, but it is the hallowed duty of the women in the non-slaveholding States, to interpose their resolute claims for the emancipation of their sex from the complex fangs of that slavery, which brutalizes the feelings, eradicates instinctive modesty and decorum, and exposes them to unceasing outrage and defilement. That woman who will not sign every petition to Congress, which demands the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, is virtually an accessory to all the atrocities which are perpetrated upon the defenceless victims of lawless lust in the slaveholding States. It is hoped that they will continue to 'cry aloud and spare not,' until the demon of impurity shall no more have its holocausts of virtuous female victims, immolated upon his impure and death-dealing altar.

The grand cause, however, of all the scoffs and reproach which the slaveholders in Congress and their accomplices effuse upon the petitioning women, is this—They deeply realize that the influence of the northern women in the Christian churches is irresistible; and it is worthy of remembrance, that very few women sign those memorials, unless they are imbued with the spirit of the gospel. In addition to which conviction, they are afraid of the effect which the pathetic remonstrances of the northern women may produce in exciting a resolute resistance, on the part of their own female associates, against the prolongation of that system of dishonour, which is equally loathsome and infamous, as it is ever exemplified around them. If the soft and sweet-toned complaints of our northern sisters fill the rampant chivalry of the South with dread, what would the trumpet-blast of their own thoughtful and conscientious domestic female relatives reverberate, did

they dare to narrate their wretchedness, their disgust, and their forebodings?

That is the result which alarms the slave-drivers. They dread lest some of the more independent and magnanimous women, who reside in Virginia or Maryland, should copy the example of Sarah Grimké and Angelina Grimké, and openly unmask the secrets of that large jail for colored people, a slaveholder's plantation, and transform their exposure of its atrocities in open day, in the form of a petition to Congress for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; and fully aware that the spirit and act would be duly appreciated, and highly contagious, they know not but their wives and daughters would rise, in all feminine energy, and demand, at least, that the natural rights of their sex should be respected, and the atrocious wrongs which they so long have endured, shall cease, henceforth and for ever. When that blissful morn arrives, there will be no more need of petitions to Congress. Mr. Patton will not be wanted as a cat's paw, to fulfil the treachery of others—our inherent privileges will no longer be trampled under foot, and the scorn of the traitors to freedom—and your thrilling eloquence, on behalf of the rights of man and christian philanthropy, will not be silenced by the enemies of truth and of godliness.

With unforgotten friend, I am,

Your faithful fellow-soldier,

A PETITIONER.

From the Herald of Freedom.

### TO THE HON. DANIEL WEBSTER.

Sir,—I perceive, by report of a discussion in your Senate on Mr. Calhoun's resolution; or rather an evasion of discussion; that Wm. C. Preston of S. Carolina threatened, that if an abolitionist should come within the borders of that State, they would hang him. The report says, that 'every man who speaks, Webster and all, take care to disclaim all sympathy with the abolitionists, and generally denounce them in hearty terms.' This, sir, I could scarcely believe to be true, but for the pregnant and significant fact, that Senator Preston dared to utter that felon threat in your presence, knowing, as most likely he did, where you came from, and amid what mountains you were born and bred. I have waited peradventure to hear in awful reproof of that miscreant threat, the voice, that in 1814 spoke of 'home-bred rights and fire-side privileges, as undoubted as the right of breathing the air, or walking the earth.' I have waited, but hear nothing but the echo of that report that 'every man, who speaks, Webster and all, &c.'

Heu! quantum ab illo! I forbear yet to pen the 'mutatus,' although the insolent Preston uttered that assassin threat, within thunder of your reply. Once he would not have dared to do it. He would once as soon have laid his hand on the mane of a sleeping lion. You heard it, and the walls of that vernal Senate House seat forth no response to the indignation of the insulted north. Where was Vermont Prentiss! Have the Green Mountains too bowed their 'freedom breathing summits' to the tyrant south! Hang an abolitionist! one of your constituents; one of the Philippies, or Quineys, or Jacksons of your own proud city; for of those names you have surely heard, sir, in your loftiest elevation! Bunker Hill! and that great granite monument foisted up upon it, in the face of insulted heaven, in mockery of departed liberty, and he, who helped old Lafayette lay its corner stone 'on the 17th of June,' made a speech then, that broke the sleep of Warren, and heaved the ocean and the land; now sitting mute in the nation's Senate House, and tamely hearing a coward slaveholder threaten his own Massachusetts constituents, before mankind, with a felon's death, for daring, within border of the old bay State, to exercise liberty of speech!

Heu! quantum mutatus ab illo! Preston ventured shrewdly. He saw that the northern lion was in the toils. He no longer feared to trifle with the sacred terrors of his name. He touched it, in sacrilegious triumph, and the de-throned monarch of the wood submitted with the abject silence of the ass. It is no apology to us, sir, that you are situated delicately. So is Preston. It is nothing to you, that we do not care for that threat, or dread its literal execution, south of Dixon's line or north of it. Our lives are murderously threatened, and you tamely endorse the threats. Our rights are openly trampled under foot, where your silence is an approval of the violation, and you are silent. Massachusetts freedom of speech, New-England liberty of the press, menaced with the death of the felon in the very teeth of their chosen champions, and in the very arena of the strife of freedom, and not a tongue moved in their vindication! 'Hung be the heavens in black, and shrouded in midnight be the height of Bunker,' exclaimed Englishman George Thompson, in noble shame at the degeneracy of the sons of his nation's ancient foe. Sunk to the unfinished summit in the ground where New-England freedom lies buried, be that monument of insensate granite! and down the top of that old smoke-crowned hill to a level with the murmuring ocean.

Sir, you and your haughty peers, in that ungodly Senate, may lightly esteem the rights and the lives of the abolitionists. You may sit calmly by, when death is threatened them, for exercising not merely their rights, but performing their solemn duty to God and man. But let me admonish you, that a host of anti-slavery spirits are gathering; a generation of assertors of just and equal liberty is rising on the scene; surely, steadily, advancing and irresistibly, in the strength of God, as the ocean tide. The wave of them will cover your dishonored names with oblivion, or cast them high astrand to rot in 'everlasting contempt.' The Reformation is spreading with marvellous power and rapidity among the people. A mighty millennial revolution is at hand. The signs of its approach, the lofty-eyed statesman does not discern. I had hoped it would be your felicity to bear an honored and leading part in this ABOLITION OF SLAVERY. But you have chosen otherwise, and God has chosen humbler instruments. So are His ways. Your wonderful powers are exhausted in more ungenial labors. You have your reward. I feel no envy for your fading laurels. I could even fondly have wished them ever green and perennial, but I cast all such wish to the winds, when I see you sit mutely by and hear a slaveholder threaten death to your own constituents, New-Englanders, for asserting, here at their mountain homes, the inalienable prerogative of free speech.

HAMPDEN.

From the Hampshire Republican.

### LETTER TO THE REV. DR. CHANNING.

NORTHAMPTON, Feb. 1, 1838.

Dear Sir:

A Letter addressed to Abolitionists, under date of Dec. 14, 1837, bearing the impress of your name, has just fallen into my hands. It is rare that your opinions on subjects of moral duty call up from my mind any other emotions, than the profoundest admiration for your liberal investigation and discriminating judgment.

But it seems to me that the remarks in this letter are predicated upon wrong assumptions; and that their tendency is to lead to important errors.

You condemn Mr. Lovejoy for resorting to arms in defence of law and liberty. And you regret that the abolitionists do not, as a body, express a decided disapproval of this act.

You observe, 'I do not say, that a man may in no case defend himself by force. But it may be laid down as a rule, hardly admitting an exception, that an enterprise of christian philanthropy is not to be carried on by force; that it is time for philanthropy to stop, when it can only advance by wading through blood. Is it asked how such a cause, if assailed, is to be advanced? I answer, by appeals to the moral sentiments and the moral sympathies of the community. What! shall men, whose starting point is the love of every human being, hope to make their way by slaughter? Shall a cause, which relies on the inculcation of the disinterested spirit of christianity as its main instrument, seek aid in deadly weapons? What fellowship has moral suasion with brute force?'

It is manifest from the above quotation, as also from the entire argument of your letter, that you make no discrimination between Mr. Lovejoy's incontinent acts, as an abolitionist, wielding the peaceful instruments of argument and moral suasion, and his ultimate act of defending the government of Illinois from being prostrated by the murderous violence of lawless men. As a christian, he did not attempt to make his way by slaughter. As a philanthropist, he sought no aid from deadly weapons. He did not take his rifle for the purpose of teaching philanthropy. It was only when the lawless assassin sought to destroy the government of the country and his own life, that he sought aid from deadly weapons.

A moment's consideration will satisfy you of the importance of a clear discrimination between specific and general objects; and that without it the conduct of any man may be made to appear not only wrong, but extremely ridiculous.

A rifle for the specific object of teaching men the gospel is indeed an inappropriate instrument; so is an axe; a plough; a purse of money. But an axe is a useful instrument to prepare timber for a meeting-house; a plough for making a road to it; and a purse of money to hire a priest. Thus then strange instruments all subserve the general object of teaching the gospel.

The general object of the mission of Jesus Christ was to exhibit to man the love of his Father toward sinners; and usually all his acts and instruments were specifically aimed to this object. But when he entered the temple, and drove out those that sold and bought therein, he laid aside the symbols of meekness and forbearance, and armed himself with instruments more appropriate for expressing his indignation at the insult and desecration offered towards the house of prayer.

The example of Christ in denouncing the hypocrisy and selfishness of the pharisees, of Peter in rebuking Ananias and Sapphira, are instances where the means employed for the general object of preaching the gospel are strangely discordant with those employed by these benevolent men, when engaged in the direct and specific exemplification of God's mercy. And Paul, with his two hundred soldiers and seventy horsemen, appears somewhat like Mr. Lovejoy with his rifle. Both are armed with instruments inappropriate for converting the hearts of men to the love of God. But why charge them with inconsistency; or why condemn their instruments as unfit for the specific purpose in view?—It is because you confound the specific with the general object.

Paul did not take his soldiers to make proselytes to christianity by brute force. Nor did Mr. Lovejoy take his rifle to shoot philanthropy into the hearts of men.

Both these men set out with the general object of persuading men to be just and holy. They wielded no other instruments for this specific purpose than moral suasion.—But the murderer had threatened to cut them off by brute force, and thus defeat them in their general object. For the specific purpose of preventing the designs of the brutal assassins, they armed themselves with rifles and swords. And who can say that, for such a purpose, the rifle and the sword are not fit instruments?

The powers that be, are ordained of God. The governments of this world were established to preserve the lives and liberties of men from the lawless destruction of the cruel. The sword is the symbol of the ruler. Reason and the common sense of men acknowledge the appropriateness. God has recognized it as a fit instrument for the ruler, because he has appointed him to be a terror to evil doers. And Christ himself, by obvious implication, allows the sword to be a proper instrument for the kingdoms of this world; when speaking of his own kingdom he says, 'If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight.'

But Christ came to establish a kingdom differing in many respects from the kingdoms of this world. His kingdom was to be an enduring one. All those established by the sword would perish with the sword. His kingdom was to subdue by love; the sword conquered by brute force. His kingdom was to rule the heart. The sword could only direct the outward act. Christ's kingdom admitted no man under its protection without holiness; the kingdoms of this world were established to hold in check the lawless and disobedient.

capable of subserving in any way the kingdom of Christ; and that all resort to its appropriate instrumentalities is incompatible with Christian duty.

The idea is certainly a mistaken one; and is maintained contrary to reason and scripture. Christ in addressing his Father says, 'All thine are mine.' And again he says, 'All power in heaven and earth is given to me.' He has on his vesture a name written, 'King of kings.'

Every thing in this world is his; and whatever of moral or physical power is entrusted to the keeping of man, is required to be used for the promotion of his kingdom. The bishops of Rome may have perverted to selfish purposes the favors afforded them by the Emperor. The fault is theirs. Constantine did right in protecting them. Those Emperors of Rome who murdered the Christian, persecuted the Christian's Lord. When Constantine, instead of murdering, showed kindness to the disciple of Christ, he honored the Son of God; and for this he will receive a reward. It was cruel and unphilosophical to use the sword for converting his heathen subjects to christianity; but to compel them to cease from the slaughter of Christians, was both wise and righteous.

The sword then is an appropriate instrument of human government, and a resort to the instrumentalities of human government for protection, is compatible with Christian duty; as much so as to resort to any human means whatever.

So long as there are lawless men upon the earth, so long will human government be necessary. And so long as government exists, it cannot, without impious contempt against the King of kings, refuse what aid it is capable of giving to the cause of Christ. It cannot compel men to be philanthropists; but it can protect the liberty and life of philanthropists from lawless violence. If it fail to do this, it is a cruel government; and guilt of the blackest dye will rest upon those concerned in its administration.

The government of this country is republican. Its power is in the people. With the people are its responsibilities. Guilt cannot rest upon the government of the United States, without implicating in some degree every one of its citizens.

Had Mr. Lovejoy been preaching philanthropy in a land of barbarians, or in a land whose laws forbid the preaching of christianity, he should have fled from one city to another. Had he been preaching in a land where murderers and robbers exercised a power above the law, he should have obeyed their mandates. Had he been preaching in a foreign land with the administration of whose government he felt no responsibility, he should have secured himself by flight.

But he was in his own land, its government was his government; and if guilt rested upon it, he was interested in washing it off. He was in a land where murderers did not rule; but where property was fully protected; and where the mob was subject to the 'will of the brotherhood,' and could be restrained. He was in a land of liberty, whose laws guaranteed the freedom of speech and the press.

The liberty of this land was threatened, and with it was threatened all that is valuable in christianity,—all that is dear to man. It was threatened not by the recklessness of the wicked; for the wicked was impelled and sustained by other powers. It was threatened by the strange infatuation of good men.

The editor, the politician, the merchant, the minister, had conspired to outlaw the abolitionists, and were calling into action and power a class of agents whose character and ultimate operations these good men seemed not to comprehend.

To the radical hating minister and politician, the mobster seemed like a man of straw. And so long as the abolitionists could be made to flee from his grimaces, the mobster would still be deemed a scarecrow.

It became necessary that his character should be developed. Lovejoy has made that development. He has shown that mobsters will become murderers; and that those who sustain them are not only the enemies of abolitionists, but the enemies of liberty, of man, and of God. In this he has performed a needful duty; and I believe that when the mists of prejudice have passed away, and all the bearings of the act revealed, the sacrifice he has made will be viewed with admiration and gratitude.

You request me to express my condemnation of the act. If from any man on earth such a request could be respected by me, that man is yourself. But neither my respect for the purity of your spirit, nor for the clearness of your judgement, can satisfy me that it is right for me to condemn Mr. Lovejoy.

The reasons with which you urge this request I have not time here to consider; and can only say that, weighty as they may be, reasons more weighty and clear urge me to a different result.

The force of your reasoning is, that the example of Mr. Lovejoy is liable to perverse imitation and construction. There can be no doubt of the fact. But such liability can never be avoided. The holiest things are misunderstood, and often wrested to the destruction of the perverse.

The consequences of such liabilities can only be estimated by the Infinite mind. All human enquiries of duty in moral action lie far within the circle of their circumference. It was not for men to calculate the consequences of the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ. All advances of knowledge in this matter is gained by first exercising faith in the wisdom of God concerning it. Did Christ lay down his life at the command of God? Then it was wise to do it, though to man it might appear foolish.

Was Mr. Lovejoy's conduct dictated by the spirit and the providence of God? I think so; and therefore I dare not condemn it.

I have occasionally seen the paper that he edited while an inhabitant of Missouri. He was at that time prejudiced against, rather than in favor of the abolitionists, and his course against slavery cannot be attributed to party feelings or self-will. The circumstances in which he was placed strongly confirm the obvious sincerity of his mind; and lead us to the assurance that his abhorrence of slavery was dictated by a deep reverence for the justice of God. The whole tone of his paper was that of deep conviction of the holiness of God's law. No man evinced more enlargement of mind, or more purity of motive.

I think the providence of God called for the act. He acted not upon his own judgement alone. He was beguiled by the holiest men around him. He began for the liberty of the black man; but the violence of his opposers had brought him into a position, where the liberty of the white man, the life almost even of the free institutions of America, seemed to be thrown upon his protection.

The freedom of the free was in imminent danger. He saw it; and he felt that on him devolved the duty of declaring it. He spoke indeed by awful emblems. But was not the bloody symbol meet for the occasion? In what other way could danger so appalling be uttered? What voice less terrible could have aroused this stupid nation? Shall I soften down this voice? I dare not do it. The interests of humanity, the terrors of God's justice forbid it. And, Sir, much as I respect you, I cannot, I dare not condemn it.

To consider the act as a defence of legal or natural rights, or as a mere effort to continue an abolition press at Alton, is a narrow view of the subject. These were the forms of the victims which the mob sought to destroy. But it was not Lovejoy's person, nor press, nor rights,

### REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

From the Annual Branch.

#### GEORGIA ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

The following Resolutions by the Episcopal Methodist clergy of Georgia, probably express the opinion of most Methodist ministers of both the old and new churches in the South and South-western States. There are connected with these churches no letter denunciations, nor unchristian attempts against the Northern abolitionists, or calling of hard names; a simple expression of their opinions and purposes. How distant from the abolitionists, who exhaust the vocabulary of hard epithets, with which to label their Southern Christian brethren; undesignating and cutting off from the communion of the faithful, all who happen by birth or otherwise, to have residence in those States where domestic slavery is established by law, he probable there are few people in the non-slaveholding States, who can subscribe to the terms of the resolution; but that of the same, we should think, very generally obtains in New England, so far as to consider it a duty to introduce it into the churches, and much more to reserve to themselves the right of doing so, as far as it is connected with civil institutions or politics.

The following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted, to wit:

Whereas there is no clause in the discipline of our church which states that we are as much bound to condemn the great evil of slavery as we are bound to use it in such a manner as to produce the impression that the Methodist Episcopal Church believed slavery to be a moral evil.

1st. Therefore Resolved, that it is the sense of the Georgia Annual Conference that slavery, as it exists in the United States, is not a moral evil.

2d. Resolved, that we view slavery as a civil and domestic institution, and one with which, as ministers of Christ, we have nothing to do, farther than to ameliorate the condition of the slave by endeavoring to impart to him and his master the benign influences of the religion of Christ, and adding both on their way to heaven.

3d. On motion it was Resolved, unanimously, that the Georgia Annual Conference regard with feelings of profound respect and approbation the dignified course pursued by our several superintendents or Bishops, in suppressing the reports that have been made by various individuals get up and protract an excitement in the churches and country on the subject of abolition.

Extract from the minutes.

THOMAS C. BENNING, Secretary.

From the Charleston Mercury.

#### THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.

Every day that passes, strengthens and multiplies the arguments in favor of this great measure. The very reasons so intemperately urged by the North against it, that it will increase the political weight of the Southern States, and perpetuate and extend the 'curse' of slavery,—are our best reasons for it. But what signifies reason of State in a matter of this kind? To be South is a question of safety, of existence. We are assailed on every side, with the most deadly spirit, and the deadliest weapons; and there is no hope, while human nature remains the same, of truce or amnesty. The moral sentiments of the world have been armed against us. Shall we stop, under such circumstances, to prize speculative Ethics, or hang our judgement on the horns of a Metaphysical Dilemma? We are on each foot. We claim no exemption from the strong instinct of self-preservation, and that power unerringly to the annexation of Texas. The slaveholding interest, wherever spread, most join their forces and stand in a body, or they will be bowed down and trampled under foot. We trust our Statesmen, in and out of Congress, will not let this matter sleep, but press it with all the determined energy, courage and obstinacy, its great importance so eminently demands. The following resolutions, brought forward at the late session of the Legislature by Mr. ALBERT RUTY, and passed with extraordinary unanimity, correctly represent the sentiments of the people of the State; and considered in relation especially to the recent unprovoked events in Congress, strike us as particularly appropriate, independent of their general policy. We invite attention to them.

Resolved, That the people of this State have witnessed with profound interest the gallant struggle of the people of Texas to emancipate themselves from the dominion of Mexico; and had with heartfelt gratification and pride their admission into the family of independent nations.

Resolved, That the incorporation of the State of Texas into the American Union, as soon as it can be effected on fair and reasonable terms, and consistent with a due regard to obligations of international faith, would eminently conduce to the interests of this confederacy.

#### VICKSBURG SENTINEL.

The Vicksburg Daily Sentinel, commenting on a notice taken of the Cincinnati Journal, by the Republican of that city, says, 'We have seen some numbers of the Journal alluded to, printed in Cincinnati, containing



they hated. It was the exercise of those rights, it was the liberty he breathed, they sought to stifle. For the purpose of destroying this liberty, they break his press and require him to be silent or flee from Alton. He might have saved his life but at the expense of that which is dearer than life.

The contest was for the liberty of the nation, for the rights of Christianity. Was it a successful one? The death of Lovejoy does not prove it otherwise. If the red blood which that death has sent through the land shall have the effect it ought to have, it will prove a profitable sacrifice. God forbid that any act of mine should hinder it. But whether this nation is aroused to repentance or not, the warning prophet of God has cleansed his skirts from our blood by shedding his own.

I agree with you, Sir, that the truth is to be vindicated rather than the character of man; that no esteem for Mr. Lovejoy is to induce us to maintain error. I should also deprecate the use of violence in the cause of abolition. Love to the slave and his master urge us to the use of pacific means in all direct efforts to emancipation. But the love of truth forbids me to condemn Mr. Lovejoy. The positions upon which I predicate his defence are, that human government, by its protecting power, is capable of subverting the cause of philanthropy; that the sword is an appropriate instrument for human government. That the power, as well as learning or wealth of this world, belongs to Christ, and that the man with whose care it is intrusted, cannot innocently withhold its protecting aid to the cause of Christian liberty and truth; and finally, that it was not as an abolitionist, that Lovejoy took arms; but as one entrusted with the power of government, and under obligations to use that power to protect the servant and rights of his heavenly master from violent destruction.

I have thought that the gathering providences of God indicated the necessity of the act, and declare it to have been done from love of truth, and reverence for the command of heaven.

Circumstances forbid my illustrating these positions with the clearness and force of which they are susceptible. But they seem to me entitled to serious consideration, and to justify me in making such suggestions of them to your notice as I have been able to do. I trust you will excuse the feebleness with which they are presented; and be assured that they are uttered with the kindest feelings towards yourself; and with entire consciousness of the reverence due to your venerable antagonist and friend.

#### AN ABOLITIONIST.

#### AMERICAN REPUBLICANISM IN EUROPE.

The following instructive and highly interesting letter from our esteemed friend, David Lee Child, who has recently returned from Europe, was read at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and ordered to be printed in the Liberator.

Boston, Jan. 23, 1838.

To Messrs. Garrison and Phelps, Committee of Arrangements, &c.

#### DEAR BROTHERS:

I regret that it will not be convenient for me to attend the anniversary meeting of our Society, for the purpose of taking a part in its proceedings. Do not suppose that this is owing to any abatement of interest or trust in our great cause; on the contrary, the cause seems to me to have so shot ahead within the last fifteen months, that you are in no small danger of receiving aid and countenance from the prudent and politic. You are now, and perhaps have been for some time, more likely to be joined by false brethren, than to be deserted by the true.

It has been my lot, during the period above mentioned, to learn much of the change which has taken place in the estimation in which we are held, as a nation, by enlightened and good men in Europe. Having formerly passed two years there, I was prepared to appreciate this change. At that time, the face of a liberal European would brighten at the name of 'American,' and he would seize the first moment of conversation, to express his admiration and his hopes of our country. During my recent sojourn, I have heard very little interest expressed in us, except to have explanations and arguments suggested, by which it could be shown to Europe, that our conduct is not the consequence of our principles.

The leading causes of the change to which I refer, are—

1st, Our mobs.

2dly, The wider knowledge which, chiefly through their instrumentality, has been diffused in Europe, of the existence and horrors of American slavery.

3dly, Our treatment of the Aborigines.

In Great Britain, France, and Germany, we are regarded as the most cruel and rapacious people, since the times of Cortez and Pizarro. Our treatment of the Aborigines appears the more odious, from the striking contrast which it exhibits with the present policy of other civilized and Christian nations.

The King of France has lately recalled the governor of French Guiana, and directed him to be brought to trial, for having issued orders to invade a settlement of runaway slaves, on the borders of that Province. The military commander is also ordered for trial by Court martial, for having executed those orders, and put to death some of those poor people.

A quarrel lately arose between the Caffres and the British colonists of the Cape of Good Hope. The governor of the Cape, at the head of the British forces, invaded the Caffre country, slaughtered many of the inhabitants, and overran the territory of a native chief, and annexed it to the Province. Dr. Phillip, the father of the Christian missions to that quarter, left the Cape in company with the deposed chief, and arrived last summer in England. At that time, a society had just been formed, called 'the Aborigines Protection Society,' of which the British Anti-Slavery leader in the House of Commons, Mr. Fowell Buxton, is President. This society examined the case, and having satisfied themselves that the colonists were the aggressors, and that the injuries for which the British arms had been carried into the Caffre country, were committed in retaliation for manifest and unprovoked wrongs, done to the natives by their Christian neighbors, they joined their representations to those of Dr. Phillip. These were so effectual with the government of the young and virtuous queen, that orders were immediately issued for restoring the conquered territory to its native sovereign and lawful proprietors, and a humane and upright man was sent out to supersede the Governor.

These bright examples, while they illustrate the justice and magnanimity of the people and rulers who have given them, react with a withering effect upon a people who have expended \$20,000,000, and are rapidly expending more, in slaughtering red men, and kidnapping them under the sacred form of a flag of trade, in order to rob them of their lands only, but also of their children.

At the request of a French literary gentleman, and of a member of the Chamber of Deputies, I reduced to writing some considerations, previously stated in conversation, tending to show, that whatever might be the apparent, there was no real foundation for the scoffs and exultation of European despots and scoundrels over the wounds which freedom has received in the house of her friends in America. I submit the following extract:

'By what I have heard from you, and from others since I arrived in Europe, I see that the

disorders, which have occurred in the United States, and remain without punishment, have disheartened the friends of civil and religious liberty, and encouraged its foes. You have not, you say, wherewith to reply to those who cite those disorders in answer to the theory of human rights. This complaint will wring the hearts of many Americans, and perhaps it may shame some.

I can only say, on this subject, as I did at the house of Mr. Garrison (the republican leader in the Chamber of Deputies), that though I must confess the existence of great evils and crimes, and that they are of a nature to be peculiarly disgraceful to a republic, yet that it is only in a republic, with a perfectly free press, freedom of speech, and freedom of association, that such potent means could have been so rapidly and extensively organized, and employed by a few of the comparatively weak to expose the corruption and oppression of the strong, to rebuke them openly, and to call upon them to forsake iniquity, and what is more irritating, upon the people to forsake them.

The difference between republics and other forms of society where there is a free press, and monarchies where the press is trammelled, is principally this; that in the former, though evils and abuses incident to human nature may exist, and gather strength for a time, yet there is a remedy in a free press and an enlightened public sentiment, which is sure to overtake them sooner or later, and to deal with them according to their nature and aggravation; whereas in other governments the evils are the same or worse, but without any remedy. It is true that the extreme publicity, which vice and misrule obtain in America through its free press, presents them in such bold relief, and under such odious aspects, that many good and liberal men are tempted to believe that American republicans are 'sinners above all other men.' Yet if the freedom of the press, of speech, and of association, (for without the last, reformers will always lack the means of employing the first,) were as great under other governments, it would only be found in the upshot, that among our American evils, we have not that master one, of losing the right to 'resist evil.'

Was it ever seen before in the whole history of the human race, that comparatively few persons, most of them young men and weak women, were carrying on in the midst of a powerful and high-spirited nation, a reform going to the foundation of their social organization, and opposed to the vehement wishes and supposed interests of ninety-nine hundredths of that nation, including government, legislature, judges, priests, lawyers, doctors, brokers, merchants, manufacturers, office-seekers, office-holders, editors, demagogues, and the lowest rabble; and yet the acts of good laws was so far sacred that, as a general thing, it preserved their lives and protected their labors?

Let those who take occasion from our American mobs to calumniate our American principles, show another nation in which this spectacle could have been witnessed. What would have been the fate of the missionaries and friends of man in the British West India Islands, if those colonies had been independent? In any other country but our American republic, we abolitionists should have been massacred or burned alive like John Huss and Jerome of Prague, Savanerra, the Albigenses and the eight thousand victims of St. Bartholomew's. Luther had a powerful prince, as a constant protector. What if that prince had been as much against him, as the American people under a strong delusion have been against us?

I would further observe that those men, who trade in the flesh of their fellow-men, who buy and keep it, are tyrants and enemies of the human race; that republicanism is not in them, but that they are in fact its greatest foes; so that American slavery is in reality to be charged to the account of despotism, instead of republicanism. Republicanism must not be held to defend against the *friendship*, as well as enmity of those men. Slaveholding and slave-trading Americans are a pretty fair copy of the ancient feudal masters of the people of Europe, not generally so ignorant as their prototypes, but all the worse for that, as their superior intelligence is employed in framing with ingenious cruelty worse laws than even disgraced Goths and Vandals.

We have had frightful and fatal mobs, and what is still more mortifying, mobs excited to extinguish light and uphold slavery; but remember that fanaticism has had its periods in all nations, and that it is as strange and extravagant in the forms which it takes as in the deeds that it does. In France, a monarch, 'father of the people,' could burn at one time fifteen hundred of his children in a church; his brutal barons burned three hundred more in a castle at another; and these merely because they persisted in worshipping God according to what they believed to be his will. In the United States, a slaveholder of my acquaintance declared that sooner than emancipate, he would lock his hundred and fifty slaves in his house, and set fire to it! Who does not see that despotism is every where the same, whether exercised by such monsters as Louis, le Gros, and Simon de Montfort, or by an American republican slaveholder!

With best wishes,

Your friend and fellow serv.

D. LEE CHILD.

#### LETTER FROM GERRIT SMITH.

Providence, Feb. 11, 1838.

#### MY DEAR FRIEND GARRISON:

Among the distinguished friends of the anti-slavery cause, who were invited to attend the last annual meeting of the Rhode Island A. S. Society, was GERRIT SMITH. My letter of invitation was written at Scituate, and as I carelessly omitted to request him to direct his reply, if he should make one, to Providence, he very naturally concluded that it would reach me at the former place. In consequence of this mistake, the following letter was not received until the 9th inst. But, although it comes at this late period, the suggestions it contains are too good to be lost, and the high respect which the abolitionists of New England entertain for brother Smith's opinions induces me to send you a copy of it for publication. I omit, however, as unimportant, that portion of it which contains his apology for not attending our meeting.

Yours sincerely,

OLIVER JOHNSON.

Peterboro, Oct. 26, 1837.

MY DEAR SIR:—\*\*\* I have not failed to notice the late conspicuous movements in New England, which affect the anti-slavery cause. I see that some of your pastors are offended at the public advocacy, by Sarah M. and Angelina E. Grimké, of the claims of impartial and universal liberty. Now, if these pastors wish our beloved sisters to be silent, that they may themselves be better heard in behalf of the enslaved poor—if they would have them retire, only that greater room may be thus afforded for their own masculine and more powerful efforts in the cause of emancipation, then it is, at the most, nothing worse than a little egotism and vanity in which their complaints originated. But, if these pastors, whilst desiring the Grimkés to quit the field, have no intention to take it themselves—if they would have men also, as well as women, to be dumb in the cause of the dumb—then, I say, let not the Grimkés only continue their advocacy—but let all the women of New England, and all the children too—yes, and the very stones of your streets, lift up their cry for the oppressed, and keep it up, until her men have quit their hiding place.

es, and come up to the help of the Lord in this cause of crushed and perishing humanity. That one, who is doing nothing for the poor slave, and intending to do nothing for him, should be occupied in pronouncing criticisms on the efforts, which others are making for him, is about as unreasonable and imprudent, as it is for the cowardly traitor to be surveying from some place of security, which he has chosen for the purpose, the wrong evolutions, and to be counting up the mistakes of his countrymen, who are perilling their all in the thickest of the battle.

The attacks on William Lloyd Garrison have, of course, gained my attention. Whatever may be the faults of that noble brother, I trust that abolitionists will never approve of the way taken by Messrs. Fitch, Towne, &c. to correct them. If injustice had been done by Mr. Garrison to Mr. White and Mr. Blagden, that injustice should not have been seized on, as an occasion for destroying his influence and usefulness, and for producing a division in our ranks. It should have been complained of to Mr. Garrison himself; and the complaint, instead of being trumpeted forth to the damage of our cause and the exultation of its enemies, should have been made in such a manner as to show, that they, who made it, tenderly regarded Mr. Garrison's feelings and reputation, and deeply felt the importance of preserving peace and harmony among abolitionists.

There is another point presented in the Appeal of Messrs. Fitch, Towne, &c. on which I must say a few words. The true-hearted abolitionists will not consent, for one moment, that a minister of the gospel is at liberty to decline reading notices of anti-slavery meetings. The declining to read such notices is a well known branch of the system of means for suppressing the discussion of the question of slavery; and the minister, who is guilty of this delinquency, takes ground with Gov. Marcy and Gov. Everett and the mobs. I readily admit, that when in the pulpit of another, a minister should not knowingly violate the usages of that pulpit. But, if it be one of those usages, that a notice of a meeting for exhortation or prayer in behalf of the millions of our enslaved countrymen shall not be read, then does the minister sin greatly, who, with this knowledge, accepts an invitation to officiate in such a pulpit. He lends his sanction to the crime of stopping the ears 'at the cry of the poor.' Would he do so, were it his own wife and children, who are 'in bonds'? Oh no—he would 'remember them,' and wish all others to 'remember them.' His selfish heart can now forget the woes of the slave, because it is the wives and children of others, and not his own wife and children, into whose hearts the iron of slavery has entered.

But I have filled my sheet, and must stop. I took up my pen, simply to say, that I could not accept your invitation—and not to write to you about matters which you understand far better than I do.

I am, my dear Sir,

With great regard, your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

#### ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASS. A. S. SOCIETY.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 27.

While the Society were waiting for the committee of business to bring something before the meeting, Mr. Hanson, of Africa, was introduced, who said:

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, *because I am black*. When I heard of this country, I was very anxious to come here—I thought it must be very much like England. Sir, I have been in England. True, I was very young then, but I was just as black as I am now; and I was respected none the less for that. But in this country, a *man* is respected according to the color of his skin, and not according to his intellect and moral worth. O Liberty, thou art fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason.

Surely, there is need of social intercourse and benevolence and fellow feeling, in such a world as this, where today we are, and to-morrow we are not. Although we are black, we have human feelings and sympathies. Look upon us and treat us just as you treat one another. This is all we ask. Every tree should be known by its fruits, and not by the bark that covers it. So every man should be known by his deeds, and not by the color of his skin.

REV. MR. GROSVENOR.

Mr. President—I have felt, during the last few moments, ashamed of my color. We have got such a habit of talking so much about color, that we have associated with it ideas of merit and demerit. I felt ashamed, while the gentleman was speaking, that we ever mention it. I was almost sorry that he felt it necessary to allude to it. I rise, if possible, to shake off the last vestige of prejudice against color; and I hope my respected friends, who are abolitionists, (and none other are worthy the name of American citizens,) will rise up with dignity above all such narrow and ignoble feelings.

MR. JOHNSON.

Mr. President—I do not rise to make a speech; but to say that there is a book for sale at the anti-slavery office, which discusses the subject of prejudice; and I hope that every abolitionist, who has a particle of this prejudice remaining, will purchase it. I allude to the well entitled *Negro Pen*.

MR. GOULD.

Mr. President—There is a gentleman in the hall, who thinks some expressions have fallen from one of the speakers, which are not correct. And, as I am convinced, from the conversation I have had with him, that he is truly a gentleman, I hope he will be heard.

THE PRESIDENT—We should be pleased to hear him.

SPEECH OF MR. HOGAN, A SLAVEHOLDER.

Mr. President—I did not intend to speak; but a sentiment has fallen from the Rev. gentleman, which I think demands to be noticed; and from himself to receive an explanation of some kind. He said no man was worthy to be called an American citizen, who is not an abolitionist. I have the honor to be an American citizen; and if I could be persuaded that I have not the right to that honor, I would give it up—I would go and abstract my name from the roll of allegiance to the constitution. But I think I have as high claims to the privileges of an American citizen as any abolitionist; and I will go farther and say, if I were an abolitionist, I should not be worthy of American citizenship. If I were an abolitionist, I would, *ipso facto*, renounce all right to citizenship; and I will tell you why. We have a written constitution; and every man that is a citizen swears that he will sustain that constitution. This oath he can take in many ways, by implication, or by assent. A native American takes no express oath, yet he swears by implication to maintain it. Now, sir, can I, as an abolitionist, take this oath? I ask it seriously: for what is abolition? It is doing away with the constitution, which you are bound by oath, as well as I, to maintain. Were I an abolitionist, I should be a perjurer. A great portion of these United States are guaranteed by the constitution, in regard to slavery. It is given to you as a right; and by whom is it given? By you, as well as by the people of the South. Is not that your pledge? I say, as long as you give me my rights in the South, by the constitution, I should be a perjurer if I should not maintain them. Why, sir, I should be indicted for rebellion, if I were an abolitionist. If the gentleman will satisfy me that I am not bound by the constitution, I will agree with him—I will be an abolitionist. Until then, I cannot.

There is another reason. It has always appeared to me very strange—nor could I even, in any work I have ever seen, be satisfied on this point. It does appear to

me very strange that there is not from cover to cover, a solitary passage in the New Testament, to sanction your proceedings. I am willing to look at the question in its full breadth—show me any commentary, show me any authority, that you are acting according to the gospel, and I will agree with you. I will go further, and state that there is not a solitary text in the Old Testament to sanction your proceedings. We know that slavery did exist under the old dispensation. I need not prove it—no one can read the Bible without being convinced of it. I know it is said that the servitude there mentioned was not upon the chattel principle. Well, prove it, then. However, I will give a suggestion or two. Joseph was sold. How was he sold? Did not the seller receive money from the buyer? He was put into prison and chained. Was there ever slavery in America worse than that? But it is said Joseph was sold by *non-pirates*. No, sir, it was servitude—chattel servitude. Again, Abraham had 300 slaves, brought up in his own family. Was this chattel servitude? I cannot say positively; but I can say as positively as I can say it was not. Again, how many slaves had Solomon? The fact is, there is no use in citing solitary instances. Slavery covered the land; and we have as good reason for believing that it was chattel slavery as we have for believing that it was not.

Again, look at Greece and Rome. Why, it has been said here that the slavery which prevailed there was not like American slavery. And where is the difference? They could not only buy and sell their slaves, but put them to death.

But again, I say there is not a solitary passage in the Bible that justifies your proceedings. We are referred to this, 'Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you.' Sir, I do not know that there is a text in the Bible that is so completely misapplied as this. The meaning of it is, that we should do unto others as we would wish them to do to us, *under similar circumstances*. If I were a slave, I would expect that my master would treat me kindly, feed me and clothe me well; but not that he would change my condition as a slave. You would not expect him as you would expect him to do to you, if he were the master and you the slave.

I could proceed further, and show from this passage, how inconsistent are your proceedings. I will show that you act as differently from the apostles as it is possible for men to act. When Paul met a runaway slave, how did he treat him? Did he say, 'I am glad you have got away from that man-chief?' No, sir, he sent him back again to his master.

MR. COLE, A COLORED CITIZEN OF BOSTON.

Mr. President—I regret that an individual possessing the ability of that gentleman, should in the nineteenth century undertake to justify that infamous system of slavery, which is practised upon my brethren at the South. He has referred to the constitution, to prove that abolitionists are not entitled to the privileges of American citizens. Sir, that constitution will bear them out. There is not a solitary word about slavery in that constitution. The word slave is not in it. The constitution merely recognizes indirectly its existence, in some of its provisions. There was a compromise made, that the slave states should be entitled to a representation for three fifths of their slave population; and that slaves who escape should be delivered up to their masters. But such cautions were the framers of that instrument, to avoid recognizing slavery as a part of our systems; and so conscious were they of its repugnance to the very spirit of our institutions, that their provisions were made without introducing into that sacred instrument the word slave or slavery. And it is evident that this compromise, so far from amounting to a perpetual guarantee of slavery, was, on all hands, considered as but a temporary arrangement. This may be learned from the speech of Mr. Madison, in the Virginia convention, for the adoption of the federal constitution. Sir, the spirit of abolition was born in Virginia. If I am not mistaken, a resolution was introduced against this slave representation. Mr. Madison says, 'The Southern states will not enter into this union, unless they are permitted a temporary continuance of this system.'

The gentleman has also gone back to ancient times. He has referred to the case of Joseph. Joseph was a Hebrew. He was *stolen*. What does he say? 'Indeed, I was *stolen away* out of the land of the Hebrews.' Is there not robbery? Joseph was the first slave that we read of, and he, speaking by divine inspiration, calls it robbery. Slavery is founded in fraud.

Again, the gentleman alluded to historical facts. Sir, we can trace the modern origin of chattel slavery. The first slave ship fitted out to the coast of Africa, was in the reign of Charles V.; and King William was the first that granted a patent to a company of merchants to go to the coast of Africa, and entrap the natives, and sell them into bondage. When this country was first discovered by Columbus, that man was a slaveholder—a slave dealer. He undertook to enslave the aborigines of this country. He sent 300 of them over to Spain, to be sold as slaves. But, there was a spark of humanity then remaining in Spain, which was shocked at the thought of such a deed. Queen Elizabeth sent back these men.

Sir, it is treachery to the sacred cause of liberty for one man to enslave another. That spirit which enslaves my colored brother at the South, would enslave every man in this house. It is not because we are *black*, that our race is enslaved. It is that domineering spirit that would enslave every man if it had the power. The spirit of *abolition* is, to do *righteousness*—not to do as you would expect the slave to do, if he were in your place; but to do all mankind what you would have them do to you.

But further, I say the argument of that gentleman is *too late*. The institution of slavery is already tottering. The day is gone by, for talking of its perpetuity. The death-rattle has begun. Under this whole system are the fires of a volcano, which, if not quenched, will produce ere long a terrible explosion. Here comes in the principle of abolition, to quench these fires, by healing up the wounds of the slave, which furnish them with fuel. Unless the holders of slaves will do *justice*, the decree of heaven has gone out for their overthrow. All injustice must ultimately call down the vengeance of the God of the oppressed; and all slavery is injustice.

MR. FAIRBANKS.

Mr. President—This gentleman has come forward and appealed to the Bible, in defence of slavery; and he says, if we can convince him that the Bible condemns it, he will be an abolitionist. I believe he is sincere; and I wish this argument might go forward on strict Christian principles. Let there be nothing personal, uncourteous, or unkind.

MR. HOGAN.

Mr. President—I merely wish you to understand that I wish to have it explained to me. I did not come prepared to enter into this discussion; especially, as I know that I am surrounded with able heads. I agree with this gentleman perfectly. Let us agree on that ground. It is not a question whether you or I shall succeed. It is a question whether we are right or wrong. I may differ from you, and you from me. We may both be wrong. But there is a rule. Let us stand upon that. Satisfy me that my God and my Savior condemns slavery, and if my voice is not lifted up against it, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth. I am sorry that you have not met for praying, I am sorry that you have recourse to such means. Last night you called slaveholders non-slaveholders. Now, I know there are among them men, who, if they could be convinced that slaveholding is wrong, would give \$10,000 among these men, some of the excellent of the earth, men of God, who have the true interests of the slaves at heart. There are two black churches in Savannah, with 1100 communicants. You have taken a wrong standard to judge us by. You take our runaway slaves, as specimens of the effects of the system. Why, sir, if every man in a state is to be regarded as a vagabond, because he is a vagabond who runs away from that state, you have enough of it in New-England. You cannot bribe my servants to leave me. Some of you got one of them away from me last year; but you could not keep her; and when she returned and told the rest of them what she had seen, they were so frightened that I could not bring one of them with me this season, unless I chained them; and so I was obliged to bring my wife on her without any servants. I ask the proceedings to be in a spirit of kindness and courtesy. Do not speak to the South as you would to a band of pirates. At least,

speak to them as Christians yourselves, if you do not believe them to be such.

MR. FULLER.

Mr. President—When the vessel which contained Mr. Hogan's slave, to which he has alluded, was lying at the wharf, our colored friends were threatened with death, if they even went on board to see whether his slave was willing to be free. I went on board the vessel in the night, with the sheriff, and found the slave, and when we put the question to her, whether she wished to be free, she said, 'O, I have a husband in Savannah.' Nothing else, I am persuaded, would ever have induced her to return.

MR. HOGAN.

I was informed that my servants would be taken away; but I said, 'I don't care; let them go if they choose.' I had several of them with me at my wife's mother's. They said, 'We have been with my mistress at her mother's four months, and then all of us ever had work herself in four months, than all of us ever had to do in the same time.' I don't wish to keep my servants against their will; but I could not bring them with me this time. They would not come.

MR. FAIRBANKS.

Mr. President—I do hope that this audience will be perfectly still. I hope there will be no clapping, while we are engaged in this discussion. We are on the word of God. It is serious business that we are engaged in. I move, sir, that we resolve to dispense with all audible demonstration of feeling, during this discussion.

Mr. Phelps seconded this resolution; and it passed unanimously, and was generally adhered to, during the discussion.

PROFESSOR COWLES, OF OBERLIN.

Mr. President—I am very glad to see this appeal lie to the Constitution and to the Bible. This is coming to the point. I should like to have Mr. Hogan mention the article of the Constitution that is violated by our proceedings. He says that abolitionists violate the Constitution; and that the Constitution has guaranteed the perpetuity of slavery. As I understand him, he says the Constitution warrants that system, untouched by any light that can be thrown upon it. Here is a copy of the Constitution, (passing it to Mr. Hogan,) will you, sir, point out the article in that Constitution, that is violated by our proceedings, or that guarantees slavery against the use of moral means to remove it?

Mr. Hogan endeavored, in various ways, to evade this question, but being pressed to the point, retreated to the articles of confederation; which Mr. Cowles maintained were of no force, after the adoption of the Constitution; but Mr. Hogan insisting that they were confirmed by that instrument, Mr. Cowles, without admitting the fact, called upon him to show that slavery was guaranteed even by the articles of confederation. Being unable to do this, he again retreated to the ground that every State has retained what it has not expressly given up by the Constitution. The slave States, when they entered into the compact, retained the exclusive control over their own domestic institutions.

Mr. Cowles—But, where is slavery guaranteed against telling the truth?

Mr. Hogan—Suppose I give you a deed of a part of a piece of property, and retain another part. This is what the Constitution has done. The northern States said, 'You give us so much, and retain so much.' The acceptance of that Constitution accedes this.

Mr. Cowles—But I don't understand, after all, how that guarantees slavery against the influence of moral means.

Mr. Hogan—A thing may be lawful and not reasonable.

Mr. Cowles—Do I understand you to say that, when we only use arguments with the slaveholders, to persuade them to give up their slaves, that we violate the Constitution? For these are the measures of abolitionists.

Mr. Hogan—You do. Suppose you give me a bill of sale of your coat. I take it. Then you say that I shall not have it, and if I do, I am a thief. Would that be doing right?

Mr. Cowles—We have never given the South a bill of sale of their slaves. But suppose, after giving you a bill of sale of my coat, I should undertake, by reason and argument, to show you that you did wrong in taking it—would that be violating my contract? All we do, in this case, is to endeavor, by presenting truth and argument to your minds, to persuade you to give up your slaves. We use no force.

Mr. Hogan—The question amounts to this. Have we given us the right to hold slaves. Is it right for you now to undertake to show that we have no right to hold them? I think not. I think that would be interfering with the right you have guaranteed to us.

Mr. Cowles—We have the right of free discussion guaranteed us by the Constitution. I never before heard such an argument against free discussion. Do you think that abolitionists are doing a more than to use argument, and entreaty, and moral influence, against slavery?

Mr. Hogan—They are using force indirectly. I have heard it said here, that there is a law paramount to the law of the land. I think we are under the strongest obligation to abide by the law of the land.

Mr. Cowles—You appealed to the Constitution, and declared that it was violated by our proceedings. That was a very grave charge; and you must not be surprised that we are sensitive on the point. Again I call for the article and section of the Constitution, that is violated when abolitionists endeavor to lay before slaveholders the truth on this subject, and persuade them to give up their slaves. Mr. Hogan shrinks from the attempt to show what articles of the Constitution we violate. It is needless, therefore, to pursue this subject further.

But to the Bible. Here is a great principle. 'He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.' Or take the great law of love. Suppose Mr. Hogan was a slave. How would he wish to be treated? Suppose the mass of masters were slaves, how would they like their masters to deal with them? Who can suppose that Mr. Hogan, if he were a slave, would rather continue so than to be free? He may think so; but the question is, what the slaves think. Do they suppose that they are treated in conformity to that law?

Again: How is this regarded by the Lord? Look into the prophets, and read the denunciation of God's wrath against those that refuse to deliver him that is oppressed, or to pay the hireling his wages. The question is, whether the slaves are by slavery oppressed? And what is oppression, if holding a man in slavery is not? Especially as American slavery is a condition in which a man has no right to himself, or his wife, or his children? What conception can we form of oppression, if this is not oppression? Hear what the Lord says, 'Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it.' If any man is spoiled, is not the slave spoiled? He is spoiled of his natural right to his own labor, to acquire knowledge, to his wife and children, and to every thing else. The Constitution of the United States declares that no man shall be deprived of his liberty, without due process of law. Slaveholders, therefore, by holding slaves, do violate both the Constitution and the Bible. Will Mr. Hogan show what *process of law* the slaves are deprived of their liberty?

Mr. Grosvenor—Mr. Hogan will probably reply that the slaves are deprived of their liberty by due process of law; as



the South, in South Carolina. I have been in Georgia. I have experienced the kindness and hospitality of many slaveholders. But, now, when I have been engaged in the exercise of the right of free discussion, with this gentleman can I take his arm and go with him to the South, and be protected by him, under the broad shield of the constitution? No, sir, I should lose my life. There is one article in that constitution that I wish him to observe, and remind his fellow citizens of it when he returns. I refer to that article which guarantees the citizens of every state the right of citizenship in every other state. Were I today in that city where I was once pastor of a church, made up of masters and slaves, I should be treated as an out-law. And for what? Because I have exercised the rights of a free citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hogan—I think there would be a great want of courtesy, if I should not acknowledge the kindness with which I have been treated. But, in allusion to what has been said, in condemning by wholesale, and in answer to the inquiry, 'Have we not a right to speak what we please?' I must say that I don't think you are any party in the case. Suppose a Southern gentleman should come here, and speak in opposition to your institutions, and rail against those things which you hold most sacred and dear to your property—

Many Voices—We hear him now.

[We did not get the remainder of Mr. Hogan's remarks. After he sat down, Mr. Grosvenor again took the floor.]

I wish to add here, that the idea just advanced by the gentleman is a most extraordinary one. What do we when we censure the institution of slavery, but to exercise the right which it is our duty to exercise? What idea had Mr. Jefferson as to the right of free discussion? In our judgment, we are only bringing truth and error in contact. What danger is the truth in, when both are left free? The gentleman mistakes the difference between using the right of free discussion in a peaceable manner, and the attempts to put it down by mobs and murder. We are threatened in the very halls of legislation with death, without the privilege of being heard in our own defence. With such death have we been visited.

Mr. Hogan—The gentleman misunderstands the question altogether. He says, under the constitution, he is liable to be seized in this way, and put to death. No, sir; it is because you are not under that protection, and you hold it in defiance. You may be right; but has not the South as good a right to judge as the North? Will you claim for yourselves what you will not allow to others? Suppose you believed me to be openly violating the constitution—what would you do? Would you allow me to persevere, and appeal to that constitution for protection? I believe the course you are pursuing is calculated to deluge the nation with blood. You do worse than to Lynch men. I put the question to yourselves: Suppose you go and preach your doctrines at the South, and stir up the slaves to insurrection, would not that be worse than Lynching men? Satisfy me that you alone have the right to judge, and then I will submit; but while I believe that one has as good a right as the other, I shall not. It is not because we are opposed to free discussion; but because you attempt to discuss a subject which the constitution forbids.

'Constitution forbids!' Why did you not, Mr. Hogan, when so severely pressed by Professor Cowles—why did you not point out the article in the constitution which forbids the discussion of slavery? Verily, if it had been there, you would have met with no embarrassment in the attempt—you would have had it at your tongue's end. I am forcibly reminded of the Catholic priest, who in a recent discussion with a Nestorian, before a Turkish mob, on the subject of image worship, declared there were passages in the Bible which justified it, but he could not find them; and being allowed in for this purpose, he absconded before the time came.

—Reporter.

## PEACE.

### [For the Liberator.] THE PRINCIPLE OF PEACE.

I have often thought that there were fewer Christians among us than is generally supposed. There are many active Abolitionists who are not Christians, either in theory or practice. A man or woman may be opposed to the unjust exercise of power in one instance, and extenuate or excuse it in another instance. Southern slavery affords the most glaring exhibition of human tyranny with which I am acquainted—insomuch so, that those who justify slavery by the Bible, would refuse to believe that Jesus Christ kept slaves, even if told that such was the case by their own clerical teachers. Slavery is, perhaps, more directly opposed to the spirit of Christianity than any other known crime; and, consequently, those who commit that crime, are more deserving the name of *heathens* than any other class of men. I know that Dr. Channing says slaveholders may be good Christians; but the pale of his Christian church is thus made to circumscribe the blackest abyss of hell. It is not strange, therefore, that many who have known but little of experimental Christianity should condemn and detest the crime of American slavery. I conceive that an anti-abolitionist is capable of any crime, and when convinced that he can do so with impunity, will not hesitate to pick a pocket, rob, or murder. I know that I speak the truth, and those whom this truth will principally offend are the very men who sought the life of George Thompson, and shouted at the fall of Lovejoy. For men's characters on change, I have learned to entertain very little respect. Most men can shed their moral characters as easily as a snake crawls out of its skin. Society is, at present, one great masquerade. The Christian virtues are represented by a sort of counterfeit money, worthless in itself, and unexchangeable. We may not be surprised, therefore, that great as the sin of slaveholding is, it finds apologists both among clergymen and gentlemen of high respectability. This latter fact proves that there is as much crime in the high places of this world as in those dens where poverty and distress force out the evil nature in the shape of theft and robbery.

The sincere abolitionist has made some progress in the acquirement of Christian views and feelings; but he is so much more an abolitionist, the more he is a Christian. In proportion as he is ruled by the mild and childlike spirit of Jesus Christ, he will be a good abolitionist. By a mild spirit, I do not mean a heart that can remain unaffected by the woes of others, and who can speak soft words to the tyrant while his victim writhes in agony at his feet. By a mild spirit, I do not mean that state of mind in which we can beat a child for playing at marbles on Sunday, and say 'How art thou, my brother?' to the priest who buys and sells his hearers. By a mild spirit, I do not mean that state of mind in which we can hate a man for differing from us in speculative belief, and hesitate to reproach him who transforms our brother into a beast of burthen. I do not call it an evidence of a Christian spirit to go to law for ten dollars, and remain calm while millions are robbed of the proceeds of their labor during life. I do not call it a proof of Christian feeling, when a gifted sister lifts up her voice for the slave, to ransack the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, to prove that he should hold her tongue, while the man of blood is welcomed to our pulpits and received as a messenger from Heaven.

But, by a mild spirit, I mean a spirit of forgiveness. I believe that the more ready we are to forgive injuries done to ourselves, individually, the more earnest we shall be in behalf of the rights of the slave, and the more indignant at his wrongs. The late Mr. Lovejoy would have given greater evidence of his love for the slave, if he had not resented the injuries offered to himself. In my opinion, he was not a Christian. The only evidence of that remains in his possessing any being in common with Christianity, was his defence of the slave; but there are many persons who possess sufficient

Christianity for that purpose, as he must be a consummate sinner who is not an abolitionist. Mr. Lovejoy's clerical profession did not constitute him a Christian. A man may preach and pray all his life, without a spark of Christianity in his bosom. I judge him solely by his actions. The man who can gird himself to go forth and bruise, wound, and mangle his fellow-creatures, is no Christian. Peter was zealous for his Lord when he smote the servant of the high priest, but it was not *Christian* zeal by which he was actuated. It was merely the common animal attachment which one man or brute may feel for another. Accordingly, Peter was the first to deny his Lord when he was led off unresistingly, like a common felon. Like many other partially converted men, Mr. Lovejoy saw the evil of slavery, but when the Spirit led him to the cross, he stumbled and fell. How inapplicable to him would have been the title of 'Christ's sheep.' Suppose he had triumphed and slain several men, whose orphans had subsequently attended the meetings where he officiated. Suppose one of the children had said on his return home, 'I have just heard a very affecting sermon from the man who killed my father!' All this is within the range of probability. It might all have taken place, if he had survived that bloody night.

The Peace principle is abolitionism completely carried out. It is a source of thankfulness that there are so many who are willing to advance as far as abolition, and although that does not make them Christians, yet it imbues them with a measure of the spirit of Christianity. The colored race are, at present, the greatest sufferers from the anti-Christian spirit of the world, and the Church must pass through the door of abolitionism before she can become Christianized. Then we shall receive more light. We shall perceive that every exercise of physical force over our fellows is criminal. Peace is the distinctive characteristic of Christianity. Without that, it would be no better than other systems of religion. The name which God has honored above every other name is 'The Prince of Peace.'

WILLIAM COMSTOCK.

### EVANGELICAL ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY. BOSTON, Feb. 17, 1838.

MR. GARRISON:—Sir—I attended a meeting of the Evangelical Anti-Slavery Society on Thursday evening last, at the Marlboro' Chapel; and as all meetings relating to slavery are more or less interesting, some account of this meeting may not be unacceptable to your readers.

The meeting was called to order by the Rev. E. M. P. Wells, and a prayer was offered by the Rev. Mr. Fitch. Mr. Wells, who evidently acted his part reluctantly, then rose and said, 'He perceived by the papers that he was expected to address the meeting, and explain the principles and objects of the Society;—but, he exclaimed, 'I find myself in a very unpleasant situation!' 'He had heard complaints against the abolitionists in this vicinity, but as he had not seen or read the organ of their society in this State, for about two years past, he could not speak from actual knowledge, concerning the justice of them.' 'I am told,' said he, 'for I have not read it, that good men have been publicly denounced, for not granting the use of a house for an Anti-Slavery Convention, in opposition to the feelings of a majority of the parish, of which they were a committee.' And this, sir, was the grand objection to the present organization, and the only specific one, advanced in the course of his remarks! His authority for the above, he very prudently kept to himself. Possibly Mr. Manager Gulliver, and his recruiting sergeant, might throw some light upon the subject, if they chose.

I was surprised that a gentleman of Mr. Wells's reputation, after having voluntarily confessed his entire ignorance of the facts in the case, should proceed to denounce those of as fair a standing in society as himself, upon the mere *ipse dixit* of others—I commend the prudence and the honesty of the speaker, in confessing his ignorance of what he stated; but I cannot justify him, in condemning those against whom he was unable to bring any accusation, from his own personal knowledge. It would seem that his ignorance should have sealed his lips in silence! Is it the duty of an honest man,—is it acting the part of a Christian, to accuse others of impurity and unchristian conduct, upon no better evidence than the assertions of an enemy? Is it just and righteous to condemn a brother unheard? What would the Rev. Mr. Wells say of an infidel, who should condemn the Bible, and denounce its doctrines, without having read it? What would he say of Congress, should they receive, and act upon, the petitions of slaveholders, and refuse even to read the petitions of the opposite party, on the same subject? If Mr. Wells had not the reputation of being an intelligent gentleman, we should conclude at once, that he not only manifested a want of common civility and Christian courtesy, but even of common intelligence!

The object in forming a new society, he said, was that they might be enabled to carry on the Anti-Slavery warfare, in a spirit of good will! This remark was repeated several times, and with peculiar emphasis.—Are we to understand by this, that the members (if it is proper to use the plural number), of the Evangelical Society cannot manifest the spirit of good will, in any other way? Or are we to understand them to accuse other societies of acting in a spirit of ill will? Let the spirit of good will decide between us and them. Good will, surely, never prompted the speaker to cast unjust aspersions upon the characters of those against whom he frankly acknowledged, he knew nothing deserving of censure!

Mr. Wells having concluded his remarks, an address was delivered by Mr. Fitch. The greater part of it was interesting and appropriate, although it was not delivered with his accustomed zeal and energy—something evidently depressed his spirits—he was not at home.—He made a few remarks upon the Evangelical organization, but stated nothing new or important.—He was willing that all, of any name, of every name, and of every name at all, who loved God, should act with the evangelists; but he gave us no rule by which to judge of this love. The Bible rule, I fear, will not answer the purpose: if it will, I cannot see the need of a new organization. I hope we shall not be left in the dark.—After the address, the constitution was read by the President, Mr. Wells, and all persons, wishing to become members, were invited to walk forward and sign their names. I did not observe that any person signed, and I therefore conclude that the original 'evangelical Christians' were left alone in their exclusiveness.

### VERMONT AWAKE!

NORTHFIELD, Vt. Feb. 5th, 1838.

DEAR BRO. GARRISON:—It is with unspeakable pleasure that I am able to announce to you, that the cause of the oppressed is onward in every part of this State. My entire time for fifteen months, has been devoted to the work of lecturing, and raising funds for the American Society; and in every place where I have as yet visited, my principles and measures have met with a warm reception by many of the thinking and good in Church and State; and it may be said, and that emphatically, that Vermont, as a whole, is RIGHT on the exciting subject;—some, to be sure, yet oppose;—but the opposition is not violent as formerly; and those who take sides against the abolitionists, (as one pro-slavery man remarked a few days since, at the close of a public debate between myself and Judge N. of Morris-town), speak just as though a divine conviction was resting on their minds, that they are opposing the principles of eternal justice and truth.

Yesterday I attended the annual meeting of the Washington County A. S. Society, at Montpelier. It was a deeply interesting season. The speeches on the occasion were generally very spirited, and much to the point; and what was better than all the rest, we had a 'chartered' right from the 'patriarchal institution' of the south to address us on the occasion. This piece of runaway property stood erect, and gave the audience a succinct account of its history for thirty-two years, and so simple and artless was the style, and so appropriate

the language, and so perfectly rational the narrative, that the evidence of its truth could not be resisted; and if I may judge from the appearance of the audience, while the stealing tongue was wiped from many an eye, the sentiment spontaneously fell from every lip, it is not a 'thing'—it is a MAN. For myself, I have not the least doubt but one of the most brilliant intellects lies hid in this human form. Who, I ask, is prepared to bear the guilt of grinding God's image to the dust, and making man a thing?

In conclusion, I would remark that the 'New Organization' has not a friend in this state, to my knowledge. We are satisfied with the old school, and think it would ill become us to array ourselves against the pioneers in this good and heavenly cause. Go on, my dear bro. Garrison, in your great and holy work of opposing the soul-destroying and God-defying system of American slavery. Be as 'harsh as truth,' but let all your weapons be SPIRITUAL—then will they be mighty, through God, to the pulling down of the strong hold of the devil, SLAVERY.

Yours for God and the oppressed,  
G. BECKLEY.

### WEST AMESBURY YOUNG MEN'S ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

At the annual meeting of the West Amesbury Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society, held on Friday evening, Jan. 26th, the following list of persons were elected as officers for the ensuing year:

President, George P. Patton; Vice President, Frederic A. Sargent; Secretary, Noah Jackman; Treasurer, Jonathan S. Osgood.

The following preamble and resolutions were then adopted.

Whereas, the interests of our country will soon be transferred from our fathers, to the young and rising generation: Therefore,

Resolved, That it is the duty of every young man to take a firm hold, and decided stand in favor of the cause of universal and impartial liberty.

Resolved, That the success which has hitherto attended the efforts of abolitionists, in this place and elsewhere, falls upon us at this time to express our gratitude to Almighty God, and should inspire us with fresh courage in the good work in which we are engaged, in hastening on that day when liberty shall be proclaimed to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to those who are bound.

It was then voted, to hold a meeting on the evening of the fourth Wednesday of each month.

Voted, unanimously, to invite William Lloyd Garrison to lecture on the subject of slavery in this place, as soon as he can make it convenient.

Voted, That the above proceedings be sent for publication to the Editor of the Liberator and Watchtower.

JAMES WHITTIER, Jr. Chairman.  
NOAH JACKMAN, Secretary.

## BOSTON.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1838.

THE Editor of the Liberator is so ill as to be unable to attend to his editorial labors, or to any correspondence. He intended to accompany the excellent letter of Henry Grew with some comments, and also the letter of 'An Abolitionist' to Dr. Channing, but is unable to do so. The former expresses his own views, religiously, in a very satisfactory manner. The latter is a conclusive reply to Dr. Channing's letter to Abolitionists, but challenges the criticism of 'ultra' peace men.

'Hampden' to Daniel Webster, can be no other than our friend N. P. Rogers of Plymouth, N. H. who always wields a pen of fire. A friend will take charge of the Liberator until the editor's recovery.

### A FREE COUNTRY.

The following letter, it will be perceived, was addressed to Francis Jackson, by his brother Hon. Wm. Jackson, while a member of Congress. It was read the other day, by Mr. Birney, to the Committee of the Legislature on the subject of slavery, &c. in the District of Columbia. It is another of the many proofs, that slavery has already in fact divided the nation, nay that it has made American citizens, who dare to cherish and avow the sentiments of Franklin, Jay and Rush on the subject of liberty, outlaws in the capital of their country. Is it then true, that slavery makes freemen outlaws in the District of Columbia, for no crime but that of being freemen? It is even so. Read the letter that follows, and while the blush is on your cheek, vow most solemnly that you will do your utmost to drive the foul monster at least from the seat of Government.

WASHINGTON, April 11, 1836.

FRANCIS JACKSON:—After a trial of ten days, and an imprisonment of eight and a half months, Dr. Crandall has been acquitted.

An intelligent and highly respectable lawyer, who has heard the trial, said but a few moments since, that the whole prosecution from beginning to end had been so utterly groundless, that all concerned in it ought to be indicted.

Immediately on receiving your letter requesting my attention to his situation, I called on Dr. Crandall, and have at different times spent several hours in conversation with him. I found him intelligent, discreet, and gentlemanly; and from inquiry learn, that he has uniformly sustained a highly respectable character in Connecticut, New-York, and Washington.

He was charged with distributing abolition tracts, which charge, if sustained, was no violation of law, nor as I understand, has a particle of evidence been adduced, either before the Grand Jury or at his trial, that he ever distributed such tracts, or any other papers relating to the subject of slavery; or that he ever attempted, in any other way, to incite upon others, in this District, his views in regard to that institution.

Thus you see, that in the Capital of our boasted Republic of Freedom, the express provisions of whose Constitution secures to all the liberty of the press and freedom of discussion, a citizen came near losing his life, and actually suffered more than eight months imprisonment for thinking differently from the majority, without publishing, or even expressing in any way, his thoughts.

After his trial was over, his innocence proved beyond all doubt, and he fully acquitted, his counsel and friends, under a conviction that he would be unsafe elsewhere, had him again locked into the prison, from whence I accompanied him to my own room after nine o'clock in the evening, where he continued until one o'clock the next morning, at which hour he left Washington for Baltimore and Philadelphia.

Thus this amiable and respectable young man's prospects are all overturned, his property sacrificed, and his health greatly injured by long imprisonment; and after full proof of his innocence, he is compelled to flee from the Capital of his country for his life, like a felon in the dark!

Yours affectionately,  
WILLIAM JACKSON.

### NEW ENGLAND SPECTATOR.

This paper, in giving notice of the recent meeting of the City Evangelical A. S. Society, speaks of it only as 'the City Anti-Slavery Society.'—Is the constitution changed; or is the Spectator sick of the term 'Evangelical,' in this connection?—But not content with this, the editor adds:—

'The Christian public may be assured, nothing will be done or said, tending to check the work of divine grace now in progress in this city.'

All the comment we have to make on this is, that, according to Messrs. Fitch, Towne & Co. 'insinuation is the meanest and vilest form of lying.'

Again, in the same number of the paper, in an article headed 'Christian Action in behalf of the slave,' is the following:—

'We know there are many, who sincerely desire to do all in their power in behalf of the suffering slave; yet they cannot conscientiously co-operate with the present anti-slavery movements, because they think they see in their principles of radicalism, which threaten to subvert the foundations of society; and because they cannot sympathize with a course of action, at war with Christian charity and the courtesies of life. We do not say, that these fears are in all respects well founded; and yet we do say, that they are not entirely destitute of foundation, nor so destitute of it as not to furnish a just ground for standing aloof from these operations.'

All this is said, observe, of 'present anti-slavery movements' generally, not of any one movement; and it charges them all alike (1) with a 'radicalism, which threatens to subvert the foundations of society' (2) with 'a course of action, at war with Christian charity

and the courtesies of life'; (3) with so much of these things, that all have 'just ground for standing aloof from these operations'; and therefore (4) 'the object of the article is to point out several ways' in which there can be 'Christian action in behalf of the slave,' 'independently of any general organization.'

To all this we say, that 'insinuation is the meanest and vilest form of lying'; that the charges made are insinuations, false and slanderous; that they are the charges of the worst enemies of the Anti-Slavery cause, but are in perfect keeping with the recent unchristian and slanderous course of the Spectator; and that, we publish them not to refute them, but as a specimen of the insinuations and slanders which that paper is continually heaping on 'the present anti-slavery movements.'

### DEMOCRACY.

We go for Democracy in its broadest sense, and we would have a party, if we could, embracing the whole family of man; but we would not, we could not, consistent with our principles, sustain men nor measures which we believe repugnant to the true democratic principle.—Daily Advocate.

That's right, friend Hallet. We go for such democracy. Therefore the first thing done, in the 'reorganization of the Democratic party,' of which you speak, will doubtless be to repudiate the 'man' who declares beforehand, that he will 'veto' the will of the majority, and that too in a republic, sooner than he will have anything to do with giving LIBERTY to one sixth of 'THE PEOPLE' in the Capital of his country, unless a slave-driving MINORITY will let him! And the next thing, in the 're-organization,' we presume will be to inform the would-be leader of democracy, that 'the true democratic principle' and the divine right of slaveholding will not 'go' together; otherwise, friend Hallet may rest assured that his 'Democracy' in the broadest sense' will be understood by real democrats to be 'stuffed.'

### PETITIONS, PETITIONS, PETITIONS.

ABOLITIONISTS OF MASSACHUSETTS.—

Twenty thousand persons have sent memorials to the State Legislature, asking that body to protest, in the name of the people, against the unconstitutional and despotic resolution, adopted by the House of Representatives of the United States, on the 21st of December last. This is well, but well needs to be made better, even on this topic. Farther, blank petitions, like that which we last week printed, have been sent to every part of the state for circulation. This petition asks the Legislature to declare (1) that Congress has Constitutional power to abolish slavery and the slave trade, in the District of Columbia; and (2) that this power should be immediately exercised. Now there are, in this State, at least 200 Anti-Slavery Societies formed on the principles of immediate emancipation. At a moderate estimate, these will average 100 members each. But few, very few of them are juvenile societies, and of the others, but a small portion of their members are minors. Besides these, there is a multitude of abolitionists in the State, who are not members of any society. So that, upon the most moderate calculation, there are in this State, at least 20,000 adults, who are immediate abolitionists, and therefore, upon this estimate, petitions ought to have been sent to the State Legislature, on the above subject, before this, from at least TWENTY-THOUSAND petitioners;—and if there had been, who does not know that the Legislature would at once speak the voice of immediatism in regard to the District? But, alas! what is the fact? Why, that on the first topic, 20,000 have petitioned, and on the latter, only 6,400! Yes, humiliating as it is, of twenty thousand adult abolitionists in the State of Massachusetts, not seven thousand have yet even ASKED their legislature to do what it can, for the overthrow of that system of abominations, which is professedly the abhorrence of their souls! Again, of more than 100 towns in the Commonwealth, in which there are flourishing abolition societies, only 36 have sent in petitions for abolition in the District. In the whole of Essex County, only four towns have sent in petitions, and yet there are in that county some ten or twelve other towns, in which are at least 2000 persons enrolled as members of abolition societies, to say nothing of the many other persons, not thus enrolled, who are for abolition in the District; and yet not a petition from one of them. In Worcester county, only nine have sent petitions; in Middlesex five, in Bristol only one and so through the state generally! Friends of the slave, is this right?—Is this abolitionism?—Is this 'remembering them that are in bonds as bound with them?' Are you to be content with this?

What then is to be done? Last year the legislature passed the following resolution:—Resolved, That Congress, having exclusive legislation in the District of Columbia, possess the right to abolish slavery in said District, and that its exercise should only be restrained by a regard to the public good.

This resolution admits the right of Congress to abolish slavery in the District, and that nothing but 'the public good' should restrain its exercise. This session the legislature should take another step, and say that justice, humanity, the honor of the nation, and 'the public good,' so far from restraining, require, not only the exercise, but the immediate exercise of this right, in the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in that District. To this end, abolitionists must now make the District their focal point of action. Besides, with 20,000 petitioners against the resolution of Dec. 21st, and only 6,400 against slavery, &c. in the District, the 6,400 look smaller than they would otherwise do, and the influence on the committee of the legislature is to make them feel, that while multitudes are ready to stand for the right of petition, the abolitionists are but a handful. In this state of things, then, the fear, if not the prospect now is, that the legislature will go but little, if at all, in advance of last year. The position of our cause is, therefore, most critical. Therefore send in the petitions—circulate them promptly and thoroughly, and in two weeks from this, let the speaker's table groan with petitions. Friends of the slave, it is for you to decide the question. Speak as freemen and free women ought to speak, and your representatives will speak as they ought. Otherwise, they will not; and if you fail in your duty, how can you blame them for failing in theirs?—Then send in the petitions.

We subjoin a form of petition.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The undersigned—of—in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, respectfully and earnestly pray your honorable bodies, without delay,

To declare that Congress has also the Constitutional right to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia; and that the rights of humanity, the claims of justice, the honor of the nation, and 'the public good,' alike demand, that in each of these respects, Congress should immediately exercise said right; and that a copy of said declarations be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives of this State, in Congress, to be, by them, laid before that body; and to each of the Governors of the several States, to be, by them, laid before their respective Legislatures; and that your honorable bodies instruct or request the Senators and Representatives of this State, in Congress, to use their utmost influence to effect an immediate and total abolition of Slavery and the Slave-trade in said District of Columbia.

LETTERS.

S. Keesee, D. J. Sexton, Thomas B. Davis, A. D. Shadd, John Cox, J. Hale, p. m., J. B. Merritt, D. & S. Bradford, J. Wright, P. Le B. Suckney.

Bro. May's lecture on Peace, at the Odeon, on Monday evening, we understood was a very impressive and uncompromising effort,—taking the ground that it is not lawful for a Christian to use physical force towards his enemies in any case whatever.

The History of the Anti-Slavery Controversy, advertised as preparing for publication, will be written by a veteran in the war, and will doubtless be a valuable and interesting work.

Mr. Comstock is alone responsible for the sentiments contained in his communication.

Please pay particular attention to the article on Returns.

RETURNS WANTED FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

There are many Anti-Slavery Societies in this State, whose officers, &c. have never been reported. It is very desirable that every Society, male, female, or juvenile, should be reported. This, therefore, is to request the Secretary, or President, or some member of each A. S. Society, in the state, to forward immediately to A. A. Phelps, Boston, the name of the Society, the names of its officers, the time of its formation, and the number of members.

W. N. B. Some societies have been recently reported. Will the proper persons see that the others are reported as soon as possible? Please attend to the matter NOW.

Boston, Feb. 9, 1838 (15).  
A. A. PHELPS, Agt.

NOTICE.

Mr. Joseph Nason, a scientific artisan of this city, will lecture before the Adelphi Union, on Tuesday evening next. Subject—The Steam Engine. Mr. Nason has taken great pains, and been at considerable expense, to make the exercises of the evening interesting. He will exhibit a number of working models of different construction, actually operating, and having attached to them machinery to illustrate the operations. The public may be assured that there will be no danger of the 'bursting of boilers,' as the preparations will all be made in another room. Those who wish to obtain seats, will do well to be in season, for so rare and interesting an exhibition will scarcely fail to bring out a full house.

WANTED IMMEDIATELY.

Enslaver, Vol. II. No. 1; and Liberator, Vol. VII. No. 17.

Any person who has a copy of either of the above, will confer a special favor, by forwarding them immediately, to A. A. Phelps, Boston.

Reader, will you be so kind as to look, now, and see if you have a copy that you can spare, for the good of the cause?

PEACE LECTURES AT THE ODEON.

The fifth lecture on peace, under the direction of the American Peace Society, will be delivered at the Odeon, Monday 26th instant, by Amasa Wallcut, Esq. on the practicability of the object. The services will commence at half past seven o'clock, P. M. and a collection will be taken.

Preparing for Publication!

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY RESPECTING SLAVERY, During the first seven years, AND OF AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETIES, From the year 1830 to 1838.

Every man should let his man-servant, and every man his maid-servant go free, that none should serve himself of them. Thus saith the Lord.—Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor!—JEREMIAH.

THE existing controversy respecting American slavery comprises the most momentous intestine collision which has arisen during the nineteenth century; for it includes the elevation of nearly three millions of human beings from the most appalling and melancholy debasement, to the character and rank of social humanity. Whether therefore we refer to the grandeur of the results, or to the magnitude of the interests which are involved, that sacred warfare is no less impressive to the sensibilities of the philanthropist, than it is agitating to the participants and to the spectators of the moral convulsion. When the clangor of the arms shall have ceased by the triumph of the Anti-Slavery champions, after they shall have brought 'into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ,' and the strong excitement which is now produced by the proximity of the battle-field shall have been deprived of its fervor—even then the annals of the present contest upon slavery will comprise one of a very instructive chapter in the history of our eventful times.

Look at the combatants. It is domestic despotism endeavoring to crush and strangle social liberty. Brotherly love, seconded by evangelical holiness, makes its assault upon selfishness and vice, entrenched in their strong holds. Upon the battlements of slavery's castle, stand armed in all dread and sanguinary array, invulnerable 'principles, powers, rulers of the darkness' of this world, and spiritual wickedness in high places;—and the fortress of iniquity is attempted to be stormed by a few scattered soldiers of 'the Prince of Peace,' whose only armor and weapons are these—'They are girded about with truth.' Righteousness and love are their breast-plate. They carry 'the shield of faith.' For a helmet, they wear 'the hope of salvation.' They wield 'the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God'—while they are 'accoutred by all prayer'—they are accounted as sheep for the slaughter; yet they 'endure hardness,' because they are certain, however protracted may be the holy war, that they will be 'more than conquerors through him who loved us.'

It is equally our duty as it is our privilege, who have been engaged in the strife from its commencement, and who have never either slept upon guard, or deserted our post, to preserve a compendious memorial of all the important facts of every kind which have transpired, during the first seven years of the conflict, relative to slavery in the United States of America. It is therefore designed to issue a standard volume, that shall embody every essentially illustrative topic, remote or immediate, which is connected with the grand inspiring theme—and thus to present to our citizens, and especially to all the members of Anti-Slavery Societies, an authentic narrative of the affecting disputation from official documents, and a chronological record sufficiently comprehensive, to supersede all reference to any other work, unless where very minute details or the precise phraseology may be indispensable.

ISAAC KNAPP.

Boston, January 1, 1838.

NAMES OF PUBLIC CHARACTERS.

TO be seen in the MASSACHUSETTS REGISTER, for 1838,—such as Judges, Governors, Justices, Counsellors, Attorneys, Sheriffs, Postmasters, Physicians, Military Officers, Ministers in every town, Literary men, Officers in Banks and Insurance Companies, Officers of the United States Government, Foreign



